



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

premeditated expansion by the United States for the purposes of extending slavery falls to the ground." Texas might have been acquired without war with Mexico, but for the disgraceful work of some of the American diplomats. Another interesting contribution by Dr. Reeves is the demonstration that President Jackson's conduct, in dealing with Mexico in reference to American claims and the annexation, was not at all what Von Holst has pictured it, but really commendable "when one considers the speed with which the United States recognized the Republic of Panama." Von Holst's reliance on Adams's *Memoirs*, Dr. Reeves says, led the German historian into error. The harm which a third political party can do to its own cause is clearly shown in the fact that "thanks to the Liberal party in the state of New York, the annexation of Texas seemed to have been endorsed by a popular vote."

That many other interesting matters are brought out in this monograph must be vouched for rather than shown. No one can neglect its use in the study of the diplomacy of this period. The book is fully annotated, and there is a fair index, but no bibliography. It is written in a clear style, plain and unadorned, which will not attract readers who have no special interest in the theme.

C. H. VAN TYNE.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

Island Possessions of the United States. By ALBERT EDWARD MCKINLEY. (Volume XX of *The History of North America*, edited by FRANCIS NEWTON THORPE.) Philadelphia, George Barrie and Sons, 1907.—xviii, 291 pp.

America as a World Power. By JOHN HOLLADAY LATANÉ. (Volume XXV of *The American Nation: A History*, edited by ALBERT BUSHNELL HART.) New York, Harper and Brothers, 1907.—xvi, 350 pp.

The United States as a World Power. By ARCHIBALD CARY COOLIDGE. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1908.—vii, 385 pp.

The last decade of American history, its new phases and the new problems it has brought, is the subject of these three volumes. Both Professor McKinley and Professor Latané have prepared, for their respective series, a very good résumé of the events, the former continuing the story into 1906, the latter well into 1907. Professor McKinley has the advantage of a somewhat more logical editorial arrangement (at least

for his volume considered by itself) and is able to treat the various new possessions of the United States each by itself, with its history both before and after American occupation. Professor Latané's book has, however, the wider scope, being a history of the decade 1897-1907; hence it has chapters on American diplomacy in the Orient, the elections of 1900 and 1904 and the chiefly domestic issues involved, the Alaskan boundary, international arbitration during the decade, the Monroe doctrine, the forcible collection of public debts, the Panama canal, immigration and economic questions and tendencies. That all these matters, even those that seem at first purely domestic, are related to our country's new position in the world is further indicated by the fact that four or five of the lectures which Professor Coolidge has put forth under a title practically identical with that of Professor Latané's book are also devoted to these matters of internal development, foreign trade, races and immigration.

It is, of course, too early for the history of the past decade to be written, in any final or complete sense. Recognizing this, all three authors have confined themselves quite closely to exposition, the two historians abstracting, in the main, the published reports that have appeared in bewildering profusion since 1898. Professor McKinley has held most consistently to this course of action, which has involved, of course, the presentation of a rather colorless narrative. That it is better to do so is indicated, however, by the fact that, in almost every case where he has expressed an opinion or summed up for brevity's sake the events of a period or the workings of a policy, he has stepped upon controversial ground. The same is the case with Professor Latané, whose narrative is less impersonal and who has hazarded as fact some statements either doubtful or incorrect.

Not only has Professor Latané covered a wider range of inquiry but he shows a more extended reading of the sources. The American sources, that is; for, like nearly all our writers on these subjects since 1898, Professors McKinley and Latané have disregarded the Spanish sources and have practically disregarded other foreign sources. As regards the Philippine Islands, such a course is absolutely fatal to the attempt to reach any independent judgment upon the situation and events merely of 1898 and thereafter; and, as regards Cuba and the war with Spain, the history can not of course be written properly if the documents of only one side are in requisition. The task that both these historians set themselves seems to have been to abstract merely the American accounts of events. And even Professor Latané, who, as already stated, has ranged more widely in the bibliography accumulated since

1898, has after all really mastered and used only the main documents in the case, those that are already best known. In other words, excellent on the whole as is his work of digest and exposition, it still can not be said to be an authoritative survey, even on the documentary side and from the American viewpoint.

This lack of an authoritative grasp is revealed in what may be termed the two-sidedness of his book. His "Critical Essay on Authorities"—a first-class condensed bibliography of the period—indicates, as does his text, a reliance upon the main official documents for the body and substance of his story. Yet when he expresses opinions or passes judgment, he does so usually as the result of adopting the testimony or views of unofficial reporters, usually hostile critics. He himself says on page 322: "In preparing this volume these [official] documents have been interpreted in the light of magazine articles, newspaper reports and editorials, and oral discussions too numerous, and in many cases too ephemeral, to be recorded."

This adoption of the views of journalist-critics writing for the moment, quite without historical perspective, is most noticeable in Professor Latané's treatment of the management of the army in 1898, and especially of the Santiago campaign. He says the commission of investigation on the conduct of the war tried to "whitewash things." He does not cite, and apparently did not consider, Secretary Alger's book, with its temperate statement of the other side and its assertion that the conduct of the Santiago campaign stands vindicated by results, while the mistakes and failures would have looked small in any prolonged war of real importance. Yet he cites quite frequently Secretary Long's book on the naval phases of the war. The "terrific accuracy" (p. 27) of the American naval gunners is an instance of the acceptance of journalistic reports written without actual investigation. Similarly as to the exaggeration of Dewey's victory; here both he and Professor McKinley would find in the Spanish sources of information on that battle very much to correct in the American reports, both official and unofficial. Likewise, if Professor McKinley had been in possession of the whole story of the *Irene* episode in Subig Bay (not mentioned by Professor Latané), an episode reflecting credit on the Germans for their action in behalf of humanity, his comment on their conduct at Manila would be considerably altered. The point is, the American public has thus far had only a one-sided account of this and various other matters; and, when history comes to be written, it ought to rectify such partial versions.

Professor Latané's account of the negotiation of the treaty of peace with Spain and of the Senate debate thereon (as also of the Supreme

Court decisions of 1901) is written from the anti-imperialist viewpoint. He never even mentions (p. 72; *cf.* also p. 102) what many, if not most, who have carefully examined the evidence will regard as the chief influence in causing President McKinley's demand for the entire Philippine archipelago, *viz.* the obligation incurred by cooperation with the insurgents. Both he and Professor McKinley overlook the real origin and explanation of the \$20,000,000 payment to Spain, though this is plainly revealed in the protocols published in Senate Document 62. Professor McKinley has often been led astray by following Foreman's unreliable statements regarding events in the Philippines before and during 1898.

Both authors likewise find warrant, in the incomplete figures regarding Filipinos killed and wounded, for general statements about the conduct of warfare by the American army which they might still further qualify if they were familiar with the various conditions of warfare in those islands. Their statements are in the main cautious, but Professor McKinley thinks "no quarter" was given (p. 241), and Professor Latané believes it probable that wounded were "ruthlessly slaughtered," and that not only torture of captives but also murder and rape were "too frequently committed." The "water-cure" aside, there is no evidence for a statement with such far-reaching implications.

Somewhat the same effect of contradiction is obtained when the official reports are followed for the account of civil government in the Philippines, while Professor H. P. Willis's book is followed for judgments on its workings. Both authors do this as regards the civil service; Professor Latané does it also as regards the friar-lands settlement and the expensiveness of the government. He says (p. 163): "The Philippines have practically no vestige of self-government." He has not noted the changes of 1905 and 1906 in provincial government, enlarging Filipino participation and voting privileges. He raises a mystery about the salaries of the commissioners (p. 169); they were fixed in 1900 by an order of the president, confirmed by Congress in 1902, and are published annually in the Philippine appropriation acts and in the Philippine civil-service roster. Both authors lay stress upon the Spooner amendment of 1901; in fact, it was disregarded by the administration, which proceeded in the Philippines under the "war power," as before that legislation, until the act of July, 1902, took effect.

One feels that Professor Latané is more at home in questions regarding Spanish-American relations, the Monroe doctrine, arbitration and peace conferences, the Alaskan boundary and diplomatic matters

generally. In the chapters dealing with those matters his touch is surer, the sense of authority more manifest. Here his book, though prepared with a different purpose, proceeds on nearly the same lines as Professor Coolidge's; and in general the two writers are in quite close agreement. There is some advantage, for purposes of comparison, in the fact that the latter's work was originally written for a foreign audience, hence has an attitude rather neutral than simply American. Professor Coolidge has here presented, with some revision, the series of lectures he delivered at the Sorbonne in 1906-1907. Besides the subjects already mentioned, he treats separately the relations of the United States with the four other "world powers," *viz.* France, Germany, Russia and England; with Canada and with Latin America; with China, with Japan and in the Pacific in general. He is optimistic as to the assimilation of our new classes of immigrants in the same way that Germans, Scandinavians, Irishmen and Englishmen have been assimilated in the past; but he leans to the view that Europeans and Asiatics can not mingle. Like Professor Latané, he is quite certain that the Monroe doctrine is a permanent feature of American policy—and, apparently, in its present widened interpretation. Both writers seem unaware of the degree of irritation which President Roosevelt's declarations have excited in Latin America.

Touching the Philippines, their acquisition and their government, Professor Coolidge holds himself quite strictly to the rôle of expositor. Minor errors of fact occur, but few controversial statements are hazarded, though he says (p. 157) that "it is certain that there would have been a large majority in favor of evacuation of the Philippine Islands," if the voters could have passed on it as an abstract question in the election of 1900. Mainly, he is interested in showing what is the American policy in the Philippines in its broad outlines, and here it is refreshing to note the absence of the usual dogmatism of the "colonial expert." Professor Coolidge accompanied the "Taft party" to the Philippines in 1905, and his attitude is one of suspended judgment, while the "Taft policy" has gained his sympathy.

In one respect, Professor Coolidge does express himself very positively, and on a matter of present moment. If the opening of our markets to Philippine sugar and tobacco is to involve preferential treatment for our goods in those islands, he makes vigorous protest (pp. 171, 182, 183) against the policy of such a violation of the "open door" principle, pointing out that there is no essential difference between our tenure there and that of Japan in Korea and Southern Manchuria.

JAMES A. LEROY.